



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,012	01/22/2002	Ariel Peled	02/23252	7791

7590 10/19/2005

G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD.  
c/o ANTHONY CASTORINA  
SUITE 207  
2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

CERVONE, MICHAEL ANTHONY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/051,012	Applicant(s) PELED ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael A. Cervone	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/22/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-179 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-179 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1/22/02 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/14/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-179 are pending.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. Dated and initialed information disclosure statement (IDS) is attached. The examiner notes that patent number 6,115,535 as disclosed in the IDS most likely refers to patent number 6,115,533 as disclosed in the applicant's specification. The examiner has considered both patents and included the latter on the accompanying Notices of References Cited (Form 892).

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because of misspellings of the words scrambling and de-scrambling in Fig. 3 items 3104 and 360, as well as the misspelling of the word components in Fig. 6 item 645. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary

to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: Examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would not classify multimedia digital content as a type of document, thus claim 3 should refer directly to independent claim 1, and not dependent claim 2. Appropriate correction is recommended.

4. Claims 166 and 174 are objected to because of the following informalities: Misspelling of the word copying. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 176 is objected to because of the following informality:  
The word effect should be the word affect. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 21, 38, 59-61, 80, 108, 109, 113-116, 134, 152, 157, 162, 166 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. The term "relatively" in claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 21, 59-61, 80, 108, 109, 133-116, 134, 162, 166 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "relatively" is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

9. The term "sufficiently similar" in claim 38 is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite. The term "sufficiently similar" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

10. Claims 152 and 157 recite the limitation "interfaces". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 62, 108, 63-88, 109-133, 152-161, 163-165 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788).

13. As per claim 62, Flavin is directed to a method for secure distribution of digital content comprising the steps of:

- a. Gathering input from at least one source (content archive). See Col. 7 lines 51-52.
- b. Producing trustworthiness credentials about the digital content's intended recipient environment based on the input. See Col. 7 lines 52-55.
- c. Evaluate the intended recipient environments trustworthiness credentials. See Col. 7 lines 25-27.
- d. Determine a distribution policy according to the trustworthiness credentials evaluation. See Col. 7 lines 36-38.
- e. Performing decisions about the distribution according to the policy. See Col. 7 lines 56-57.

14. As per claim 108, Flavin is directed to a method for secure distribution of digital content comprising the steps of:

- a. Transferring digital media to an untrusted environment (distributors/subscribers computer). See Col. 4 lines 16-18.
- b. Using a relatively trusted environment (watchdog) within said untrusted environment (distributors/subscribers computer) operable to receive digital content, said relatively trusted environment (watchdog) comprises of mechanisms to restrict tampering with said relatively trusted environment (Tamper Protection). See Col. 3 lines 36-41 and Col. 4 lines 8-15.

15. As per claim 63, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is a document (world wide web pages). See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

16. As per claim 64, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is multimedia digital content. See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

17. As per claim 65, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 64. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is an audio digital content (music). See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

18. As per claim 66, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 64.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is a video digital content (movies).

See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

19. As per claim 67, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 64.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content consists of at least two different streams (digital video). See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

20. As per claim 68, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise geo-location information (pre-specified area). See Col. 7 lines 25-35.

21. As per claim 69, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise geo-location (pre-specified area) authentication level (Subscribers selection programs) information. See Col. 7 lines 25- 35 and lines 48-67.

22. As per claim 70, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise authentication level (Subscribers selection programs) information. See Col. 7 lines 48-67.



23. As per claim 71, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise information gathered in the past (content archive). See Col. 7 lines 36-41.

24. As per claim 72, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 71.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise information gathered from the analysis of information gathered in the past (content archive). See Col. 7 lines 36-45.

25. As per claim 73, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 71.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered in the past comprises of usage information (customized advertisements). See Col. 8 lines 4-13.

26. As per claim 74, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise of information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

27. As per claim 75, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 74.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the software environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

28. As per claim 76, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 74. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the hardware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

29. As per claim 77, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 76. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the hardware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the video output hardware in the environment. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

30. As per claim 78, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 76. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the hardware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the sound output hardware in the environment. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

31. As per claim 79, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 74. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the firmware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

32. As per claim 80, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise of reports from at least one relatively trusted component (distribution log of watchdog). See Col. 4 lines 36-42.

33. As per claim 81, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components reside in the consumer's (subscriber's) computer. See Col. 4 lines 31- 42 and Col. 8 lines 63-65.

34. As per claim 82, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of components is connected to the consumer's (subscriber's) computer. See Col. 4 lines 31-42 and Col. 8 lines 58-63.

35. As per claim 83, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

36. As per claim 84, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

37. As per claim 85, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a tamper resistant component component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60.

38. As per claim 86, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

39. As per claim 87, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 83.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the software components is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

40. As per claim 88, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 84.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the firmware components is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

41. As per claim 89, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the method comprises of using at least one updateable component. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

42. As per claim 109, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches the relatively trusted environment (watchdog) comprises of at least two components. See Col. 4 lines 32-36.

43. As per claim 110, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the components comprise of at least one hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. [Although Flavin is specifically referring to the watchdog itself, it is obvious that if the watchdog is a hardware component, then there exists at least one hardware component. Therefore the examiner asserts that Flavin does teach the components comprise at least one hardware component].

44. As per claim 111, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the components comprise of at least one software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. [Although Flavin is specifically referring to the watchdog itself, it is obvious that if the watchdog is a software component, then there exists at least one software component. Therefore the examiner asserts that Flavin does teach the components comprise at least one software component].

45. As per claim 112, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109.

Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the components comprise of at least one firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. [Although Flavin is specifically referring to the watchdog itself, it is obvious that if the watchdog is a firmware component, then there

exists at least one firmware component. Therefore the examiner asserts that Flavin does teach the components comprise at least one firmware component].

46. As per claim 113, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the relatively trusted environment is a hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

47. As per claim 114, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the relatively trusted environment is a firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

48. As per claim 115, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the relatively trusted environment is a software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

49. As per claim 116, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109. Furthermore Flavin teaches that the components comprise a watchdog component, wherein the watchdog component is capable of monitoring other components of the relatively trusted environment. See Col. 4 lines 29-43.

50. As per claim 117, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring comprises of authentication. See Col. 4 lines 32-43 and Col. 3 lines 59-65.

51. As per claim 118, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 117. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication comprises authentication of a certificate. See Col. 5 lines 28-31.

52. As per claim 119, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 118. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the certificate is a cryptographic certificate. See Col. 5 lines 28-31.

53. As per claim 120, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 117. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication comprises of the authentication of the code of the component. See Col. 5 lines 25-28.

54. As per claim 121, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 120. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication of the code of the component comprises calculating a derivative of the code. See Col. 5 lines 25-28.

55. As per claim 122, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 120. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication of the code of the component

comprises calculating an analysis of the potential operation of the code. See Col. 5 lines 25-28.

56. As per claim 123, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 117. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication comprises of a challenge-response method which comprises of a step in which the watchdog component queries the authenticated component issuing an input and further comprises of a later step in which the authenticated component issues an output to the watchdog, the output dependent on the input and the authentication is based on the correctness of the output depending on the input. See Col. 5 lines 16-37.

57. As per claim 124, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring comprises monitoring of the operation of the components. See Abstract and Col. 3 lines 36-41.

58. As per claim 125, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 124. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of the operation of the components comprises monitoring of the used interfaces (processing engine). See Col. 5 lines 28-33.

59. As per claim 126, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises



monitoring of used operating system calls. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

60. As per claim 127, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of file (records) operations. See Col. 4 lines 36-42 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

61. As per claim 128, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of memory operations. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

62. As per claim 129, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of communication operations (log). See Col. 5 lines 6-15 and 28-33.

63. As per claim 130, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of driver operations. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

64. As per claim 131, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of input operations.

65. As per claim 132, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of output operations. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

66. As per claim 133, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of interfaces used by interfaced entities. See Col. 5 lines 28-33.

67. As per claim 134, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the relatively trusted environment comprises at least one updateable component. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

68. As per claims 152-155 and 157-160, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 116-119. Claims 152-155 and 157-160 are rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 116-119, respectively.

69. As per claim 156, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 153. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 123. Claim 156 is rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 123.

70. As per claim 161, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 158. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 123. Claim 161 is rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 123.

71. As per claim 163, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered from monitoring by at least one component is transferred to the watchdog component by said component. See Col. 5 lines 16-36 and Fig. 4.

72. As per claim 164, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 163. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered by the watchdog component is transferred as credentials information to a credentials based decision making mechanism (Authenticated Execution Unit). See Col. 5 lines 16-36 and Fig. 4.

73. As per claim 165, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered by the watchdog component is transferred as credentials information to a credentials based decision making mechanism (Authenticated Execution Unit). See Col. 5 lines 16-36 and Fig. 4.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

74. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2131

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

75. Claims 1-41 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246) in view of Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788).

76. As per claim 1, Yeung is directed towards a method for secure distribution of digital content to an untrusted environment comprising the steps of:

- a. Constructing at least two digital inputs (key 1 or 2 and content 900), said inputs are operable in order to reproduce said digital content. See Figure 9.
- b. Transferring digital media to an environment (Client Platform 120) such that each of the inputs (key 1 or 2 and content 900) is transmitted via a different path and combining said inputs in order to reproduce said digital content. See Figure 9.

Yeung fails to disclose constructing a relatively trusted environment within untrusted environment. Flavin discloses a watchdog for trusted electronic content distribution that constructs a relatively trusted environment (watch puppy) within an untrusted environment (subscriber site). See Col. 8 lines 45-50.

Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin.

The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

77. As per claim 2, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content is a document (text). See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

78. As per claim 3, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 2. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content is multimedia digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

79. As per claim 4, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 3. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the multimedia digital content is an audio digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

80. As per claim 5, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 3. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the multimedia digital content is a video digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

81. As per claim 6, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 3. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the multimedia digital content consists of at least two different streams. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

82. As per claim 7, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 6. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that at least one of the different streams consists of video digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

83. As per claim 8, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 6. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that at least one of the different streams consists of audio digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

84. As per claim 9, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 6. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that at least one of the different streams consists of textual digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

85. As per claim 10, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the untrusted environment comprises a consumer's (client) computer. See Fig 9 item 120.

86. As per claim 11, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a relatively trusted environment comprising of a

software component, however Flavin teaches a relatively trusted environment (watchdog) comprising of a software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

87. As per claim 12, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 11. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updateable software component, however Flavin teaches that the software component is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

Art Unit: 2131

88. As per claim 13, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 11. Yeung does not specifically refer to a tamper resistant software component, however Flavin teaches that the software component comprises of at least one tamper resistant software component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

89. As per claim 14, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 13. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updatable software component, however Flavin teaches that at least one of the software components is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).



90. As per claim 15, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a relatively trusted environment comprising of a hardware component, however Flavin teaches that the relatively trusted environment (watchdog) comprises of a hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

91. As per claim 16, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 15. Yeung does not specifically refer to a tamper resistant hardware component, however Flavin teaches that the hardware component comprises of at least one tamper resistant hardware component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

92. As per claim 17, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a relatively trusted environment comprising of a firmware component, however Flavin teaches that the relatively trusted environment (watchdog) comprises of a firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

93. As per claim 18, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 17. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updateable firmware component, however Flavin teaches that the firmware component is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy

measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

94. As per claim 19, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 17. Yeung does not specifically refer to a tamper resistant firmware component, however Flavin teaches that the firmware component comprises of at least one tamper resistant firmware component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

95. As per claim 20, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 19. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updatable tamper resistant firmware component, however Flavin teaches that at least one of the tamper resistant firmware components are updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by

providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

96. As per claim 21, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a relatively trusted environment comprising of at least two components, however Flavin teaches that the relatively trusted environment comprises at least two components. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

97. As per claims 22-31, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 21. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 11-20. Claims 22-31 are rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 11-20, respectively.

98. As per claim 32, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung discloses a method wherein one of the inputs comprises of a key. See Fig. 9.

99. As per claim 33, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 32. Furthermore, Yeung discloses a method wherein the key is a cryptographic key. See Col. 3, lines 15-28.

100. As per claim 34, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 32. Furthermore, Yeung discloses a method wherein the key is a scrambling key. See Col. 6, lines 32-36.

101. As per claim 35, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung discloses at least one of the inputs comprises of a scrambled copy of digital content (content 900) and at least one other input comprises of the information needed for said reproduction (key 1 and 2). See Figure 9.

102. As per claim 36, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung disclose a group of at least two inputs comprising a function of a scrambled copy of said digital content and at least one other input comprising of the information needed for reconstruction (Key). See Col. 7 lines 37-41.

103. As per claim 37, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches the reproduction results in an output which is identical to the said digital content. Col. 8 lines 10-12.

104. As per claim 38, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches the reproduction results in an output which is sufficiently similar to the said digital content. Col. 8 lines 6-10.

105. As per claim 39, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung disclose a group of at least two inputs comprising a function of a digital content. See Col. 7 lines 37-41.

106. As per claim 40, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 39. Furthermore, Yeung disclose a function comprising splitting the digital content into inputs. See Col. 7 lines 37-41.

107. As per claim 41, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updateable component, however Flavin teaches that software updates are available. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Therefore, the examiner asserts that Flavin teaches an updateable component. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

108. As per claim 59, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content is split into separate inputs (Data [prior to scrambling] and Keys) in a relatively trusted server (Server Platform 110), server is operable to deliver said digital content to said relatively trusted environment in the form of separate inputs (Data and Keys). See Fig. 9 and Col. 9 lines 23-50.

109. As per claim 60, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 59. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content arrives in the form of second separate inputs (Data Content 900 and Keys) different from the first separate inputs to the relatively trusted server (Server Platform 110), the relatively trusted server is operable to rearrange said content to the form of first separate inputs (Descrambled Data and Keys). See Fig. 9 and Col. 9 lines 23-50.

110. As per claim 61, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content arrives in the form of separate inputs (Data and Keys) to a server (Server Platform 110), the server is operable to deliver the digital content to the relatively trusted environment in the form of separate inputs (Data and Keys). See Fig. 9 and Col. 9 lines 23-50.

111. Claims 42-58, 90-107, and 135-151 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246) in view of Flavin et al.

(US Patent Number 6,219,788) and in further view of Symantec (User Manual and Notification Page).

112. As per claim 42, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose the updateable component being associated with a revision level identifier. Symantec, however, teaches a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater that is associated with a revision level identifier (Sequence Number). See Intelligent Updater Notification Page. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

113. As per claim 43, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Symantec discloses the revision level identifier is a version number (Defs Version). See Intelligent Updater Notification Page. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the



art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

114. As per claim 44, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Symantec discloses the revision level identifier is a revision date (Extended Version). See Intelligent Updater Notification Page. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

115. As per claim 45, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Yeung discloses an aspect of the operation of the underlying system (rendering) depending on the revision level. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include

the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

116. As per claim 46, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 45. Furthermore, Yeung discloses at least some functionality of the underlying system (rendering) is limited if the revision level does not belong to a specific set of revision levels. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

117. As per claim 47, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 46. Furthermore, Yeung discloses the limited functionality comprises of the ability to receive a set of digital content. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent

Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

118. As per claim 48, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 46. Furthermore, Yeung discloses the limited functionality comprises of the ability to receive a set of digital content in a specific format (lesser quality). See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

119. As per claim 49, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 46. Furthermore, Yeung discloses the limited functionality comprises of the ability to receive a set of digital content in a specific method. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include

the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

120. As per claim 50, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the revision level is communicated to at least one other component (Antivirus Software) of the underlying system by the updateable component (LiveUpdate/Intelligent Updater). See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

121. As per claim 51, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 50. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the communication is initiated by the updateable component. See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent

Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

122. As per claim 52, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 50. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the communication is part of another communication that is part of the normal workflow of the underlying system. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

123. As per claim 53, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 50. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the communication is initiated by the other component of the underlying system. See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

124. As per claim 54, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

125. As per claim 55, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the transfer of updateable component (download) is

performed automatically without intervention. See User Manual page

38-39. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

126. As per claim 56, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the transfer of the updateable component (download) is initiated by approval. See User Manual pages 37-38. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

127. As per claim 57, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the installation of the updateable component is performed automatically without intervention. See User Manual page 38-39. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

128. As per claim 58, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the installation of the updateable component is initiated by



approval. See User Manual pages 37-38. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

129. As per claims 90-106 and 135-151, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claims 89 and 134, respectively. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 42-58. Claims 90-107 and 135-151 are rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 42-58.

130. As per claim 107, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claims 89. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 90. Claim 107 is rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 90.

131. Claims 162, 166-170 and 174-177 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788) as applied to claim 108 above, and further in view of Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246).

132. As per claim 162, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Flavin teaches digital content arriving into the relatively trusted environment (watchdog). See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Flavin fails to disclose that it arrives in a cryptographically encrypted form. Yeung, however, teaches digital content (content 290) arriving in a cryptographically encrypted form. See Col. 6 lines 32-36 and Figure 2. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include cryptographic encryption of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user or manipulated by a malicious program (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

133. As per claim 166, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Flavin fails to disclose the environment comprising a mechanism to restrict copying of at least one of the outputs the environment generates. Yeung teaches a mechanism (watermark extraction mechanism) for restricting copying of at least one output. See Col. 8 line 58 - Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 8. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

134. As per claim 167, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 166. Flavin fails to disclose the output being part of an internal interface. Yeung, however, teaches the output being part on an internal interface. See Col. 8 line 58 - Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 8. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

135. As per claim 168, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 166. Flavin fails to disclose the output being an external output. Yeung, however, teaches the output being an external output (content player). See Col. 8 line 58 - Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 9. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

Art Unit: 2131

136. As per claim 169, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 168. Flavin fails to disclose the external output is sound output. Yeung, however, teaches the external output (content player) is sound output. See Col. 2 line 60 - Col. 3 line 5. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

137. As per claim 170, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 168. Flavin fails to disclose the external output is video output. Yeung, however, teaches the external output (content player) is video output. See Col. 2 line 60 - Col. 3 line 5. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

138. As per claim 174, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in rejection of claim 166. Flavin fails to disclose that the mechanism to restrict copying comprises of altering

Art Unit: 2131

the output in order to change the quality of the copy. Yeung, however, teaches that the mechanism to restrict copying comprises of altering the output in order to change the quality of the copy which is produced by the copying. See Col. 8 line 1-20. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

139. As per claim 175, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in rejection of claim 174. Flavin fails to disclose that the quality of the copy is the observable quality of the copy. Yeung, however, teaches that the quality of the copy is the observable quality of the copy. See Col. 8 line 1-20 and Fig. 6. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

140. As per claim 176, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in rejection of claim 174. Flavin fails to disclose that the change of the quality is to adversely affect the quality. Yeung, however, teaches that the change of the quality is to adversely affect

Art Unit: 2131

the quality. See Col. 8 line 1-20 and Fig. 6. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

141. As per claim 177, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 174. Flavin fails to disclose the copying is digital copying. Yeung, however, teaches the copying is digital copying. See Col. 8 line 58 - Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 8. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

142. Claims 171-173 and 178-179 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788) in view of Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246) and further in view of Wang (US Patent Number 6,885,748).

Art Unit: 2131

143. As per claim 171, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 168. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the external output is analog output. Wang, however, teaches the external output (content player) is analog output. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

144. As per claim 172, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 171. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the analog output is analog sound output. Wang, however, teaches the analog output is analog sound output. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

145. As per claim 173, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 171. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the analog output is analog video

output. Wang, however, teaches the analog output is analog video output. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

146. As per claim 178, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 174. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the copying is non-digital copying. Wang, however, teaches the copying is non-digital copying. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

147. As per claim 179, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 174. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the digital copying involves non-digital transition. Wang, however, teaches the digital copying involves non-digital transition. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because



Art Unit: 2131

they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael A. Cervone whose telephone number is 571-272-3712. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAC 9/23/2005

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100